

# The Washington Times

(Every Day in the Year)  
OWNED AND ISSUED BY

**The Washington Times**  
Publishing Company  
Editor: MARSHALL CUSHING;  
City Editor: EMORY FOSTER.  
Office: HUTCHINS BUILDING,  
CORNER TENTH AND D STREETS NORTHWEST.  
Telephone—Editorial Rooms, 337-3.  
Business Office, 337-2.  
Price, Daily Edition..... One Cent.  
Sunday Edition..... Five Cents.  
By carriers, by the week..... Ten Cents.

TRADE MARK  
REGISTERED

WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 13, 1894.

The Weather To-day.  
For the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia: Fair; northerly winds; slightly warmer.

There have been many governments before which rejected the divine right of kings or emperors, but here we have an entirely new foundation, in the declaration that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it."

Now any logical person need not ask himself or herself what is the only method by which consent to government can be manifested in order to see at a glance the full significance of the American ballot. It is, in itself, simply a symbol of justice, a sign of recognition of the individual's right to express consent or dissent in regard to governmental affairs. It is a standing recognition that "taxation without representation is tyranny," and that all who are taxed are entitled to at least a voice in the choice of their representatives. It is an acknowledgment of the sovereignty of the individual. To confer this badge of sovereignty is to bestow upon the individual a national honor, a mark of national dignity. Its bestowal signifies that the individual upon whom this honor is conferred is not only to be recognized the world over as capable of self-government, but also as a worthy assistant in the sacred duty of promoting and preserving the public good.

Thus it will be readily seen by every thoughtful person that the possession of title to exercise the American franchise is the highest honor the United States can bestow, and, conversely, to withhold such right, duty, or privilege is proof that those from whom it is withheld are deemed neither capable of self-government nor fit assistants in the task of securing political order, peace, happiness, and prosperity. Hence, the possession and non-possession of the ballot inevitably divides the people of the United States into two classes, namely, the people who are publicly honored and the people who are publicly dishonored.

Now if those who were thus honored were a caste composed wholly of the educated, the thoughtful, the wise, the industrious, the temperate, the honest, the moral, kind, and good; in a word, if it were a caste of character, there would be no fault found with such discrimination on general principles, though even such an establishment of caste is unconstitutional. But what is the dividing line in the United States? Who are sovereigns and who subjects? What is necessary that one may consent to one's own government and have a voice in the affairs for which all are taxed and in which all men are equally interested?

Incredible as it must seem to every reasoning person, the chief qualification—the only, qualification agreed upon by all states and territories without exception—demanded of the individual upon whom the United States confer the highest honors is, to be a male person! Some states discriminate more and some less, some do and some do not exclude the women, the pauper and the idiot male person, but with one small, one new, and one partial exception every state and territory in this republic civilized country excludes women! Behold the class catalogued as unfit for self-government published in the Tribune Almanac of 1893:

Persons under guardianship, aliens, minors, bigamists, polygamists, Indians, Chinamen, felons, robbers, forgers, counterfeiters, perjurers, embezzlers, illiterates, lunatics, convicts, infamous criminals, traitors, idiots, and all women!

Here we have a published list of all the disordered, into whose category are forced the mothers, the sisters, the wives, the daughters of every household in this republic. And yet men hold women responsible for lack of intelligence for good over their sons! The indignation of mothers whose sons know that the whole body of American men refuse to count the opinions of women! She must, indeed, be a rarely gifted woman who can exert good influence under such enormous disadvantage placed upon her by her state or country!

The first result of the enfranchisement of women in New York will be the added respect which must come to any state which lifts its mothers, wives, sisters, and daughters out of the criminal and idiot class and recognizes them as a part of the self-governing people. The second result will be the increased intelligence of women which must accrue from the knowledge that they are expected to know something about public welfare.

The third result will be the growing comradeship, the increasing mutual respect between men and women, as women increase in breadth of knowledge and thus become more truly helpful to themselves and to all others. And the ultimate result will be the assurance of public good which attends every substitution of honesty for dishonesty, of truth and sincerity for falsehood and hypocrisy. Every celebration of the American Declaration of Independence is, at present, an act of national hypocrisy. The enfranchisement of the women—the female people—of New York will be a grand move toward restoring harmony between American professions and American practice.

SEAN B. ANTHONY.  
HITS—OR MISSES.

It is suggested that Judge Caldwell, before leaving the bench to coquette with Presidential nominations, should keep steadily before him the example of one Gresham, lately of Chicago.

Senator Hill is out of politics—out of income-tax politics, that is to say.

It now remains for Carl Browne to discover that all gail is divided into three parts.

Spring is found in the almanacs all right.

Make no mistake about it, I am a Democrat just as much as ever—D. B. Hill.

Hon. Billy Mason is ambitious to succeed Mr. Cullom, and he is organizing debating clubs in Chicago for the purpose.

Thus far Gen. Lew Wallace has secured no member for his band of forty American immortals.

It has been observed that Judge Bradley will be entitled to the damages if ever the case is ended.

It cannot truthfully be said that the swelling in the President's foot is due to his extensive use of it in kicking out hold-over Republicans.

Have another one with you, Governor Tillman; things are getting dull again down your way.

Mr. St. Gaudens might design a few decorative medals for the Navy Department while he is about it.

It would be just like us all to come out of this sympathy with the man.

Comptroller Eekels is in Boston helping Secretary Morton exterminate the gypsy mob.

The Democratic party is disappointed to hear Frank Lawler as well as to Hon. Carl Schurz.

As Mr. Holman seems likely to be returned to Congress, he is rather sorry that he began to advocate \$4,000 salaries for Congressmen.

Col. McClure takes his desk in the Philadelphia Times office after an absence of several months. And how things will hum in the Philadelphia Times office now.

It is said that poker players are "looking to Europe," but many of our local celebrities

to understand the ultimate result of the enfranchisement of all the adult, sane, non-criminal, non-pauper, tax-paying female citizens of New York, it is necessary, first, to understand what is the American principle of government. Strangely enough, very few Americans seem to have the faintest conception of what this peculiar principle is. I call it a peculiar principle, for, as it is expressed

## AS THE CROWDS COME OUT.

Barrett's Hamlet is at times the strongest thing that he does. It is, as the critics have said, a new Hamlet in certain scenes, although his conception of the character is not different in essentials from the others of men who believe the prince's insanity feigned. He shows this belief more clearly in his action, and has added business to add in showing it. His mocking of Polonius is made more effective than by others. He has his concealed listeners to the conversation between Hamlet and Ophelia show themselves visibly to Hamlet and to the audience. These are more of the nature of opinion, and are not the acting of the man. No one should dispute that at times he reaches very nearly a perfect rendering of the lines. It is studied, restrained, and yet forcible, and it is poetic.

But we may say all these things and yet not pronounce him a great Hamlet. I do not think he is that. His entire ability to restrain himself at times, and to show some moment where he, as Hamlet, feels Hamlet's temporary passions, prevent his action from at any time rising to great enthusiasm.

In the minor matters of stage business, or the matters which ought to be minor I believe he makes grave mistakes. Hamlet, if it is anything, is sufficient unto itself. It is a sublime tragedy. Now Mr. Barrett adds touches which savor unpleasantly of melodrama. For instance, in the last scene Horatio gives the dying prince's father's picture to look at. He shows it to him, and the prince and the queen the picture of the dead king is shown to him. The other picture is a small cabinet-size picture, almost I had thought a photograph. He compares the two and throws the new king's likeness onto the floor and stamps on it. When he comes in again in a few moments he stamps on it again. Now, is this living tragedy?

WHY MARRIAGE HAPPENS  
NOT TO BE IN FAVOR.

Marriage does not at present enjoy the universal sanction which so ancient and admirable an institution merits. Every sensible young fellow knows that the best way to stand life with a discreet and amiable wife. Young men of intellect and ambitious purpose regard marriage as a prudent investment as well as a matter of romance. Young women, however (according to the New York Press), are not always actuated by such economic principles in matrimony. It would seem that other factors, and romantic standard whereby they measure, and romantic money, unfortunately do not come up to its requirements. This is a system that is certain to break down, and the result will be a bad thing that is taught by the novelist and preached by the playwright exists only in fancy.

"In this rapid pace at which our sisters advanced within the last year. Since she gained educational emancipation, woman has been a creature of the future, and not of the past. She is no longer satisfied with whiskers and gaudy in one who aspires to her companionship. Men are doing their utmost to keep the pace with the new and lively intelligence of women has set for them. It is not the women of the future, but the women of the present who do not perceive in matrimony that achievement of ambition which was formerly the object of feminine hopes have recently abandoned the habit of waiting for an independent career. They no longer wait patiently and dutifully for the arrival of a Sir Lancelot, who may never come, but regard marriage as a means of escape from a life of monotony. They have discovered in the various professions a certain employment for the instincts of sentiment and perseverance that used to be less easily engaged in needlework and domestic cares.

"In this new phase of affairs women can wait for the coming suitors who are worthy of them, and who will not be content with a life of monotony. They are no longer satisfied with whiskers and gaudy in one who aspires to her companionship. Men are doing their utmost to keep the pace with the new and lively intelligence of women has set for them. It is not the women of the future, but the women of the present who do not perceive in matrimony that achievement of ambition which was formerly the object of feminine hopes have recently abandoned the habit of waiting for an independent career. They no longer wait patiently and dutifully for the arrival of a Sir Lancelot, who may never come, but regard marriage as a means of escape from a life of monotony. They have discovered in the various professions a certain employment for the instincts of sentiment and perseverance that used to be less easily engaged in needlework and domestic cares.

John O'Neill, the contesting Missourian, who finally succeeded in having his claims in the Joy district recognized by the suffrage of the House after several weeks of campaigning by his friends and buttonholing and telegraphing by himself, has gone straight off and gotten photographed with his most winning smile and statesmanlike expression. If you go alone photographable row on Pennsylvania avenue below the Metropolitan hotel you will find O'Neill's picture in at least one of them. It is a picture of a man, and not a picture of a hundred of his colleagues, and unlike the rest signed with an autograph so ambitious that it covers nearly one-half the portrait. It is a picture of a man, and not a picture of a hundred of his colleagues, and unlike the rest signed with an autograph so ambitious that it covers nearly one-half the portrait.

A Southern Democrat said bitterly yesterday in speaking of the northern defection in this party: "Well, I'm glad of it. Let them go where they belong. Perhaps I ought not to go so far as to say so, but I am sure they are the fellows, but they are never with us. Their motto is certainly 'Rule or Ruin.'"

Hon. Richard Parks Bland wants free coinage of silver bullion and absolutely nothing else. He is tired with compromises, with substitutes, with sentimental expressions of opinion, with resolutions informing Mexico that if she is tired of making a good selection or other profit out of the manufacture of Mexican silver dollars we will help her, and, in short, against everything that does not give the owner of a certain amount of silver the privilege of having it coined into legal tender money.

He expressed himself also yesterday as being opposed to the Meyer bill, which practically needs to the suggestion in the last two paragraphs of the veto of the signature bill, and authorizes a bond issue to protect the reserves if the silver signature is coined as earned.

Three from a man Topics.  
Dax—There's a great man who hits me for a tender every week.  
Max—God, how much greater he'll be if he got it.

Editor-in-Chief—Whom have you sent to criticize the art exhibition?  
City Editor—The Turkish head reporter.

Dizon—How do you remember what your wife wants you to bring home?  
The string around your neck is made of her amateur waffles.

Nothing Else on Earth.  
Old Doc Whiskers—I have had my life insured for \$50,000 in your favor. Is there anything else I can do to please you?  
Mrs. Doc Whiskers (his young wife)—Nothing on earth, Doc—just die.

AT YOUR GATE.  
My darling! My darling! My darling!  
Do you know how I love you tonight?  
Why, even tonight, put away, dear.  
From the light of your eyes though I stand,  
I feel as if I were in your arms.  
The touch of your hand.

Once again with its wondrous caressing  
It soothes my deep wound like a balm;  
Once again with an exquisite blessing  
It hushes my grief into calm;  
And all the dear charm of your presence,  
My darling, is with me now.  
And takes, like some mystical essence,  
The sting from my pain.

Ah, me! for a word that could move you  
Like a whisper of magic art  
I love you! I love you! I love you!  
There is no other word in a heart.  
Will your eyes that were loving still love me?  
Will your heart, once so tender, forgive me?  
Ah, darling! sleep down from above me  
And tell me to live.

As Mr. Holman seems likely to be returned to Congress, he is rather sorry that he began to advocate \$4,000 salaries for Congressmen.

Col. McClure takes his desk in the Philadelphia Times office after an absence of several months. And how things will hum in the Philadelphia Times office now.

It is said that poker players are "looking to Europe," but many of our local celebrities

## FOUND VERY GUILTY.

Jack the Slasher, convicted on Four Counts and Remanded for Sentence.  
District Attorney Birney yesterday morning concluded the case against George Taylor, alias George Jones, who as "Jack the Slasher," amused himself during the "Winter" in keeping feminine wits in tremulous vibration.

When brought into court, "Jack" dropped into a chair and assumed an attitude as graceful as it was picturesque, and his graceful posture was maintained throughout the court proceedings. The courtroom was crowded with sensation-seekers, and it was observed that the feminine department of life was well represented.

In his argument before the jury, Mr. Birney concluded that the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

## THE CROWDS COME OUT.

Barrett's Hamlet is at times the strongest thing that he does. It is, as the critics have said, a new Hamlet in certain scenes, although his conception of the character is not different in essentials from the others of men who believe the prince's insanity feigned. He shows this belief more clearly in his action, and has added business to add in showing it. His mocking of Polonius is made more effective than by others. He has his concealed listeners to the conversation between Hamlet and Ophelia show themselves visibly to Hamlet and to the audience. These are more of the nature of opinion, and are not the acting of the man. No one should dispute that at times he reaches very nearly a perfect rendering of the lines. It is studied, restrained, and yet forcible, and it is poetic.

But we may say all these things and yet not pronounce him a great Hamlet. I do not think he is that. His entire ability to restrain himself at times, and to show some moment where he, as Hamlet, feels Hamlet's temporary passions, prevent his action from at any time rising to great enthusiasm.

In the minor matters of stage business, or the matters which ought to be minor I believe he makes grave mistakes. Hamlet, if it is anything, is sufficient unto itself. It is a sublime tragedy. Now Mr. Barrett adds touches which savor unpleasantly of melodrama. For instance, in the last scene Horatio gives the dying prince's father's picture to look at. He shows it to him, and the prince and the queen the picture of the dead king is shown to him. The other picture is a small cabinet-size picture, almost I had thought a photograph. He compares the two and throws the new king's likeness onto the floor and stamps on it. When he comes in again in a few moments he stamps on it again. Now, is this living tragedy?

WHY MARRIAGE HAPPENS  
NOT TO BE IN FAVOR.

Marriage does not at present enjoy the universal sanction which so ancient and admirable an institution merits. Every sensible young fellow knows that the best way to stand life with a discreet and amiable wife. Young men of intellect and ambitious purpose regard marriage as a prudent investment as well as a matter of romance. Young women, however (according to the New York Press), are not always actuated by such economic principles in matrimony. It would seem that other factors, and romantic standard whereby they measure, and romantic money, unfortunately do not come up to its requirements. This is a system that is certain to break down, and the result will be a bad thing that is taught by the novelist and preached by the playwright exists only in fancy.

"In this rapid pace at which our sisters advanced within the last year. Since she gained educational emancipation, woman has been a creature of the future, and not of the past. She is no longer satisfied with whiskers and gaudy in one who aspires to her companionship. Men are doing their utmost to keep the pace with the new and lively intelligence of women has set for them. It is not the women of the future, but the women of the present who do not perceive in matrimony that achievement of ambition which was formerly the object of feminine hopes have recently abandoned the habit of waiting for an independent career. They no longer wait patiently and dutifully for the arrival of a Sir Lancelot, who may never come, but regard marriage as a means of escape from a life of monotony. They have discovered in the various professions a certain employment for the instincts of sentiment and perseverance that used to be less easily engaged in needlework and domestic cares.

"In this new phase of affairs women can wait for the coming suitors who are worthy of them, and who will not be content with a life of monotony. They are no longer satisfied with whiskers and gaudy in one who aspires to her companionship. Men are doing their utmost to keep the pace with the new and lively intelligence of women has set for them. It is not the women of the future, but the women of the present who do not perceive in matrimony that achievement of ambition which was formerly the object of feminine hopes have recently abandoned the habit of waiting for an independent career. They no longer wait patiently and dutifully for the arrival of a Sir Lancelot, who may never come, but regard marriage as a means of escape from a life of monotony. They have discovered in the various professions a certain employment for the instincts of sentiment and perseverance that used to be less easily engaged in needlework and domestic cares.

John O'Neill, the contesting Missourian, who finally succeeded in having his claims in the Joy district recognized by the suffrage of the House after several weeks of campaigning by his friends and buttonholing and telegraphing by himself, has gone straight off and gotten photographed with his most winning smile and statesmanlike expression. If you go alone photographable row on Pennsylvania avenue below the Metropolitan hotel you will find O'Neill's picture in at least one of them. It is a picture of a man, and not a picture of a hundred of his colleagues, and unlike the rest signed with an autograph so ambitious that it covers nearly one-half the portrait. It is a picture of a man, and not a picture of a hundred of his colleagues, and unlike the rest signed with an autograph so ambitious that it covers nearly one-half the portrait.

A Southern Democrat said bitterly yesterday in speaking of the northern defection in this party: "Well, I'm glad of it. Let them go where they belong. Perhaps I ought not to go so far as to say so, but I am sure they are the fellows, but they are never with us. Their motto is certainly 'Rule or Ruin.'"

Hon. Richard Parks Bland wants free coinage of silver bullion and absolutely nothing else. He is tired with compromises, with substitutes, with sentimental expressions of opinion, with resolutions informing Mexico that if she is tired of making a good selection or other profit out of the manufacture of Mexican silver dollars we will help her, and, in short, against everything that does not give the owner of a certain amount of silver the privilege of having it coined into legal tender money.

He expressed himself also yesterday as being opposed to the Meyer bill, which practically needs to the suggestion in the last two paragraphs of the veto of the signature bill, and authorizes a bond issue to protect the reserves if the silver signature is coined as earned.

Three from a man Topics.  
Dax—There's a great man who hits me for a tender every week.  
Max—God, how much greater he'll be if he got it.

Editor-in-Chief—Whom have you sent to criticize the art exhibition?  
City Editor—The Turkish head reporter.

Dizon—How do you remember what your wife wants you to bring home?  
The string around your neck is made of her amateur waffles.

Nothing Else on Earth.  
Old Doc Whiskers—I have had my life insured for \$50,000 in your favor. Is there anything else I can do to please you?  
Mrs. Doc Whiskers (his young wife)—Nothing on earth, Doc—just die.

AT YOUR GATE.  
My darling! My darling! My darling!  
Do you know how I love you tonight?  
Why, even tonight, put away, dear.  
From the light of your eyes though I stand,  
I feel as if I were in your arms.  
The touch of your hand.

Once again with its wondrous caressing  
It soothes my deep wound like a balm;  
Once again with an exquisite blessing  
It hushes my grief into calm;  
And all the dear charm of your presence,  
My darling, is with me now.  
And takes, like some mystical essence,  
The sting from my pain.

Ah, me! for a word that could move you  
Like a whisper of magic art  
I love you! I love you! I love you!  
There is no other word in a heart.  
Will your eyes that were loving still love me?  
Will your heart, once so tender, forgive me?  
Ah, darling! sleep down from above me  
And tell me to live.

As Mr. Holman seems likely to be returned to Congress, he is rather sorry that he began to advocate \$4,000 salaries for Congressmen.

Col. McClure takes his desk in the Philadelphia Times office after an absence of several months. And how things will hum in the Philadelphia Times office now.

It is said that poker players are "looking to Europe," but many of our local celebrities

## FOUND VERY GUILTY.

Jack the Slasher, convicted on Four Counts and Remanded for Sentence.  
District Attorney Birney yesterday morning concluded the case against George Taylor, alias George Jones, who as "Jack the Slasher," amused himself during the "Winter" in keeping feminine wits in tremulous vibration.

When brought into court, "Jack" dropped into a chair and assumed an attitude as graceful as it was picturesque, and his graceful posture was maintained throughout the court proceedings. The courtroom was crowded with sensation-seekers, and it was observed that the feminine department of life was well represented.

In his argument before the jury, Mr. Birney concluded that the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.

The judge held that partial insanity was no excuse for crime, unless the defendant was not of sound mind, and that the question at issue was as to the capacity of the man to distinguish right from wrong. Mr. Birney then briefly discussed the testimony rendered, and contended that "Jack" knew he was committing wrong in entering Mr. Holland's house.

At the conclusion of the District Attorney's argument, Judge Cole delivered a liberal and comprehensive charge to the jury. He explained the charge in the indictment, for housebreaking, and asserted that the only question to be determined was as to whether the prisoner had mind enough at the time of the crime to form the intent to steal.